

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-20 are pending in the Application.
- Claims 1-20 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 1, 8, and 17 are amended by Applicant.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-20 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action dated 8/23/06 lists 31 separate collects of words (terms) used in the claims 1-20 that are not found literally in the specification and are regarded as not sufficiently descriptive so as to particularly point out subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The present Office Action states that the terms are indefinite as being subject to variable interpretations as to meanings. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 17 to more clearly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicant most respectfully submits that one of skill in the art of software editors would easily be able to interpret the terms of the claims in the context set by the amendments. Applicant respectfully submits that the use of commonly used words or terms used in combination in a claim is acceptable drafting practice. Applicant submits that this is true even if those specific commonly used word combinations and commonly understood terms are not drawn literally from the specification. In this specific instance, Applicant respectfully submits that the words and terms can be easily understood by one of skill in software arts given the context set by the current claim amendments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection because the amendments place the subject matter of the claims in a software editor context and the referenced 31 English word combinations or terms can now be more readily understood in context by those of skill in the art.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-20 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,895,477 to Orr et al. (Orr). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Orr teaches at col. 2 lines 50-60:

“An embodiment of the present invention provides for a three-way separation of the information in a document. In a particular embodiment, the document is separated into its content, design and media aspects. Through this representation, an embodiment of the present invention is better able to support automatic rendering to multiple forms of media. For example, embodiments of the present invention support the automatic integration, composition and layout of content from multiple sources into intelligent dynamic document templates instantly publishable in media such as print, Intranet, Internet, and in an OLE embedding.” (col. 2, lines 50-60).

Applicant notes that the teachings of Orr include a method that separates information in a document into separate content, design, and media aspects. This is performed to render information into multiple forms of different media such as print and internet publishing. According to the Abstract of Orr, the method taught by Orr adds content to a composition having a chosen design and automatically calculates a layout for the composition.

An example application entitled the Brochure Composition Example is provided in Orr, col. 18 lines 33-60, with respect to a fixed brochure composition of Figure 9 and its change to a different media form depicted in Figures 12a-c. Orr states:

“FIGS. 12a, 12b and 12c illustrate at 190 the brochure composition of FIG. 9 that has been rendered to HTML media. In this example, the single page paper media layout of FIG. 9 has been automatically transformed into a three-page HTML layout suitable for presentation on the World Wide Web, for example. This rendering to a different media may occur when a user executes a command from the user interface to publish the composition to a new media.

FIG. 12a shows a title page 192, FIG. 12b shows a first page 194 for the first product, and FIG. 12c shows a second page 196 for the second product. The title page 192 of FIG. 12a includes the title "Bass Products" 162 and the fish logo 164 from FIG. 9, but these content elements have been automatically scaled and located in a different

position on the title page. Also included in the title page is now a "What's New" link 198 that links the user to another Web page. Also automatically created is a brochure table of contents 198 that includes forward links to "Rod Products" 200 and "Net Products" 202. Also included on this title page 192 is a link to a "Talk to Us" Web page 204. The first page 194 includes the image caption and product text from the original FIG. 9. Also included with this first page is the title and fish logo from FIG. 9 and a new link "Home Page" 206 with a backward link to the title page 192. The second page 196 for the second product likewise includes the original image, caption and product text from FIG. 9 and also includes the title, fish logo and new "Home Page" link 208." (col. 18, lines 33-60.)

Applicant notes that pages 5-6 of the present Office Action cite the above portion of Orr to teach an original text file containing other files, a first page being converted to HTML from an original page, HTML content elements being automatically scaled to fit the page, and the changed documents being formatted to fit the original page to result in a final file in the original format.

Applicant respectfully submits that the conversion of a file to a different media type, as in the example of Figure 12a-c in Orr is not analogous to the present invention. For example, Claim 1 of the present Application is directed to a system for preserving original formatting characters of a text file that is edited in a software development environment. Applicant submits that whereas Orr is directed to a design engine for the automatic layout of content (Orr, Title), the present invention is directed to the preservation of original character formatting of a text file that is input to an editor in a software development system.

In a genuine effort to more clearly define the subject matter of the present invention, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 17 to include elements which define the invention as one which is used to preserve original formatting characters in a file that is edited in a software development environment. In such an environment, an original input file can lose its character formatting automatically via entry into the development environment. Subsequent edits may be made by a user. The final file is generated as a result of processing by a source code preservation module. However, instead of the final file being produced without the original formatting characters, the present invention preserves the original

formatting characters even though the development environment automatically modifies the original formatting characters. Applicant finds support for the amendments throughout the originally filed specification, but notes that paragraphs 0002-0008 explain the problem and a solution and the example of Figures 4a-b and the corresponding text of paragraphs 0039-0042 also supports the clarifying amendments herein.

Applicant notes that Orr does not teach a source code preservation technique which restores the original formatting characters to a final file having user edits in a system where the software development system automatically modifies the original formatting characters. Orr does teach, in a software application environment, taking a document from one media, such as a print media, to a different media, such as an HTML media. Orr also teaches font and text size changes in order to insert new text to stay within the layout format of a given amount of space for text (See Orr, col. 26 lines 27-32). But, Orr does not teach the preservation of character formatting in the software development environment where the development environment automatically modifies the formatting characters of the original file. As stated in the originally filed specification, such formatting characters include, but are not limited to such characters as a carriage return, linefeed, space, tab and so on.. Orr does not address the restoration of such formatting characters in an edited file in a software development environment.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Orr does not anticipate amended Claim 1 because not all elements of amended Claim 1 are taught by Orr. Specifically, Orr fails to teach the elements of:

(1) preserving original formatting characters in a text file that is edited in a software development environment,

(2) a software development environment editor, the editor comprising software that inputs an original text file having original formatting characters and produces a first modified text file, the first modified text file having automatic formatting character modifications made by the editor, the editor accepting user changes to the first modified text file to produce a second modified text file having the automatic formatting character modifications and the user edits, and

(3) a source code preservation module that receives the original text file, compares the first modified text file with the second modified text file to find a modified block of text and

applies the modified block of text to the original text file to generate a final file with the original formatting characters, whereby the source code preservation module preserves the original formatting characters in the final file.

Since Orr does not teach all of the elements of amended Claim 1, then Orr cannot anticipate Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 according to MPEP §2131. Applicant submits that independent Claims 8 and 17 are likewise amended to include at least the elements of preserving character formatting in a software development system which automatically modifies character formatting. Accordingly, Orr cannot anticipate any of amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 17 and their respective independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection because Claims 1-20 patentably define over the cited art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all pending claims in light of the amendments and discussion provided above.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 16, 2006

\Jerome G. Schaefer\

Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439